

Some Questions Concerning C P I (M L)

Six Leaders' Letter Published in **Frontier**

A letter reported to have been circulated by a number of CPI (ML) leaders, in jail now, quite sometime before Charu Mazumdar's arrest and death in jail custody was published in **Frontier** dated the 4th **November** 1972. Excerpts of the said letter were also previously published in certain bourgeois newspapers.

In the said letter the six leaders of the CPI(ML) cited the suggestions sent by the Chinese Communist Party and made certain observations regarding the mistakes committed by the CPI (ML). Nothing is known about the authenticity of these suggestions by the Chinese Communist Party as cited in the letter; but since the issues involved in those suggestions, said to have been made by the CPC are very important we feel that the Naxalite friends will seriously consider the letter to ponder certain very important questions of Marxism-Leninism and also about a correct Marxist-Leninist party. Without a genuine working class party,

R. K. B.

establishment of socialism through revolution is not possible and with this alleged aim in view the CPI(ML) was formed by the Naxalites. We know that in India, it is due to the failure of communist movement that the Indian people have to pay the price heavily and so the Naxalites wanted to form a genuine communist party by breaking out from the CPI(M), which again in its turn broke away from the CPI with the same objective of forming a correct Marxist-Leninist party. This letter circulated by the six CPI(ML) leaders will, on scrutiny, provide us the clue whether the CPI(ML) has been able to break the non-Marxian process of thinking of the old undivided CPI and the CPM or the process of this party is just a continuation of that of the old undivided CPI and the CPM.

The mistakes mentioned by the CPC as quoted in the

letter circulated by the six leaders of the CPI(ML) are as follows :—

(1) To call a chairman of one party as the chairman of another party is wrong, and ...it will wound the national sentiment of the working class of this country.

(2) Your idea of united front is wrong. You have said that the united front will come into being only after the formation of some base areas. This is a mechanical understanding. The united front is a process. The united front comes into being at every stage of struggle, and again it breaks down. This is not a permanent organisation. There is, no doubt, that the worker peasant unity is its main basis. But the main understanding behind the united front is the unity between the exploiter and the exploited (those exploiters who are not the main target of the revolution). The characterisation of the bourgeoisie as a whole com-prador is wrong.

(3) Regarding the formulation that the open trade union, open mass organisations and mass movements are out of date, and taking to secret assassination as the only way: This idea needs rethinking. Formerly we misunderstood your word 'Annihilation'. We used to think that the idea is taken from our Chairman's war of annihilation. But in July 1970 issue of *Liberation*, the CPI (ML) organ, we came to understand that this annihilation means secret assassination.

(4) You have applied Lin Pia'o People's War Theory in a mechanical way. Lin's

(Contd. to page 2)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA

(Fortnightly)

Editor-in-Chief—**Shibdas Ghosh**

VOL. 6
No. 8

1 DECEMBER, '72
FRIDAY

PRICE 20 P.
Air Surcharge 4. P.

On Some Comments by CPM Leaders in Chandigarh

Recently Mr. Jyoti Basu, the CPI(M) leader, while speaking to the press reporters in Chandigarh has put some comments in regard to the policies pursued by the Congress(R) headed by Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Some other prominent leaders of the party also have expressed views similar to that expressed by Mr. Basu.

Now for obvious reasons, the comments made by Mr. Basu and the other leaders of the CPI(M), have drawn our attention and we would like to put our considered view on some of those comments.

It has been stated by Mr. Basu that if only the Prime Minister followed her own precepts "why should there be all this opposition to her". Mr. Basu has been said to have conceded that "the victory of the Congress(R)-CPI alliance and the rout of the rightist forces in elections in 1971 and 1972 was a gain for socialism to the extent

for the Congress party to implement the programme it has put before the people.

Like Mr. Basu, other CPM leaders of the Central Committee who appeared in the Press expressed a similar view and have observed that "The Congress had taken some positive steps, such as seeking the economic co-operation of the Soviet Union, amendment of fundamental rights and creation of a radical climate. But the party had proved itself incapable of following up its socialist promises and postures with action" (**Statesman**, dated 11.11.72).

From these facts it would appear to any sensible man that the CPI(M) and its leaders including Mr. Basu are still suffering from confusions in regard to the real political character of the Congress(R) and the aims and objectives of the so-called 'progressive' social democratic measures suggested by the party. At times the CPI (M) appears to be strongly critical about the CPI in regard to its attitude to the Congress(R) but what would appear queer to the left and democratic people is that like the CPI, the CPI(M) also feels that the measures

(Contd. to Page 4)

Subir Basu Roy
that a climate of radicalism was created. It was advance in the sense that a positive programme of some radical measures was placed before the people." (**Statesman**, dated 9.11.72) However, what Mr. Basu felt was that "none could obscure the fact that throughout the time since her victory Mrs. Gandhi had not taken even one radical step that his party could applaud". He felt that the programme put forward by Mrs. Gandhi before the people was, no doubt, positive and radical in nature but he believed that it was impossible

To a Communist Admission of Mistake is Not Enough

(Contd. from page 1)

guerrilla way theory is a military affair. During the anti-Japanese resistance war when we had an army of 10 lakhs, at that time some comrades in the army raised a slogan that positional warfare and mobile warfare are the way to mobilise the people. In reply to this wrong theory Comrade Lin said that Guerrilla war is the only way to mobilise the people. This military theory has no relation with political and organisational question.

(5) Regarding the formulation that if a revolutionary does not make his hand red with the blood of class enemies, then he is not a communist. If this be the yardstick of a communist then that communist party cannot remain a communist party.

(6) No stress has been given on agrarian revolution and the slogan for the seizure of the state power is counterposed to the land problem. There is no agrarian programme.

(7) Without mass struggle and mass organisation the peasants' armed struggle cannot be sustained. The Communist Party of China supported Naxalbari struggle not merely as a struggle for the seizure of state power. The article 'Spring Thunder' published in China in support of Naxalbari and published in *Liberation* will clarify it.

The observations made by the six leaders of the CPI(ML) in the said latter may be summarised as follows:

(1) Comrade Charu Mazumdar should have accepted the suggestions of the CPC at once.

(2) In case of any reservation on the part of Com. Mazumdar regarding these suggestions by the CPC he should have circulated the fraternal party's suggestions to all the party units for discussion.

(3) In not circulating these suggestions to all the party units Com. Mazumdar

continued "*the bad old method and practice followed inside the Indian communist movement.*" (Italics ours).

(4) Owing to left adventurist deviations, the CPI(ML) is "split into groups and factions".

(5) Comrade Charu Mazumdar is mainly responsible for the left adventurist deviations.

(6) All the members of the Central Committee cannot also shirk their responsibility for this left adventurist deviations.

(7) Mistakes are to be rectified by accepting the suggestions from the great glorious and correct Chinese Communist Party as the basis without any reservation and a new unity among the different groups within the CPI(ML) is to be forged for carrying forward the armed agrarian struggle.

Firstly, it must be mentioned that some of the points of the CPC seems to be vague and inadequate and so it is not possible to comment on them without any further elaboration by the CPC. But most of these mistakes pointed out by the CPC and other valuable criticisms by us were elaborately and exhaustively dealt in our Party organs and booklets much before the CPC sent those suggestions to the CPI(ML). But curiously the leaders of the CPI(ML) did not pay any heed to those valuable suggestions in spite of the fact that those were based on reason and correct Marxist-Leninist approach. But criticisms made by the CPC were readily accepted. Naxalite friends should ponder whether such behaviour corresponds to the Marxist-Leninist way of thinking.

The CPC pointed out that to call a Chairman of one party as the Chairman of another party is wrong and it would wound the national sentiment of the working class of this country. We pointed out many times that this was completely erroneous

to call Chairman of China as Chairman of Indian party. By such wrong slogans the CPI(ML) had not only wounded the national sentiment of the working class and the patriotic feeling of the Indian people but had done much damage to the revolutionary movement by indirectly lowering the prestige of the great leader of China. That the emergence of a leader in our national soil, who will concretise Marxism-Leninism and the task of building up of a communist party which is essentially linked up with the struggle for the emergence of such a leader is a necessary pre-condition for the success of Indian revolution, was not realised by the CPI(ML) and this was why the CPI(ML), instead of carrying out such a struggle for the emergence of collective leadership to be concretised through a particular leader, blindly relied on the Chairman of China.

We fully agree with the CPC regarding the idea of united front. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, the leader and teacher of our Party and one of the renowned Marxist thinkers of the age elaborately dealt on the question of united front in his speech delivered after the fall of Nambudiripad Ministry in Kerala. The necessity of united front on the basis of a certain minimum programme between different left parties on the basis of unity-struggle-unity was brilliantly explained in the said speech (the speech was subsequently published in a booklet). But the CPI(ML) did not pay any heed to that analysis of U.F. and, on the contrary, they took recourse to slander against us because of our attempt to forge unity with different parties for carrying forward the democratic struggle in our country.

The CPC has condemned the tactics of secret assassination; but long ago the CPC sent its criticism we criticised the secret assassina-

tion tactics of CPI(ML) as opposed to the principle of Marxism-Leninism. Com. Ghosh has shown in the book dealing **Why SUC is the only Communist Party in India** that by such acts of individual stray terrorism, the Naxalites are, instead of following Mao, really following Debray's theory. In spite of such correct criticism based on reasoning, the CPI(ML) did not take any notice of it.

That the CPI(ML) has mixed up the land reform movement with the question of seizure of state power was pointed out in an article published in *Ganadabi* (our Bengali organ) dated 15th August 1967. In the said article it was shown that two types of mistakes were seen in the land reform movement. While the CPM reflected legalistic attitude, the CPI(ML) made no difference of it with the seizure of state power. Land reform movement is essentially a democratic movement and so during the movement, whether peaceful or armed as the case might be, the door for negotiated settlement must be kept open and with the realisation of the democratic objectives the movement ends. It was cautioned there that the call for seizure of power must be preceded by painstaking struggle in the ideological, cultural and political sphere resulting in the establishment of both organisational and ideological leadership of the revolutionary party over the toiling people and building up of different organisations of the masses. But the CPI(ML) did not care to conduct painstaking and protracted struggles for building up of mass organisations and mass movement and called for seizure of state power without any necessary preparation. Moreover, they confused the tactics of Guerrilla Warfare with that of Peoples' Democratic Revolution, and the tactics of encircling cities

C P I (ML) Committed Mistakes of Fundamental Nature

by liberated areas in villages. Much before the CPC pointed out this gross misconception, it was pointed out by Com. Ghosh in the book mentioned above that the programme of guerrilla warfare had no connection with the Peoples' democratic Revolution and the tactics of guerrilla warfare had to be adopted in the national liberation struggle, people's democratic revolution or even in socialist revolution if these struggles were protracted.

It is clear that the six leaders of the CPI(M L) have admitted the mistakes and accepted "with utmost devotion and frankness" their guilt. But it was not enough to admit mistakes and to accept one's own guilt since a party can make two types of mistakes. A party may err in pursuing the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism in every aspect of life because of its failure to grasp the essential and fundamental Marxist-Leninist angularity and methodology. And the other type of mistake is that while the party has in the main correctly grasped the Marxist-Leninist angularity and methodology it may err in correctly applying the fundamental principles properly analysing the concrete situation for lack of experience and knowledge. So far as the mistake of the former type is concerned, it is essentially linked up with the class character of the party and the mistake of the latter type does not alter the class character of the party unless such mistakes are repeated one after another, in which case the class character of the party may also be subsequently changed. Com. Shibdas Ghosh, the leader and teacher of our Party and one of the renowned Marxist thinkers of the age, has taught us that it is not enough to a Marxist to admit mistakes, but he must determine the character of these mistakes. The six leaders of

the C P I (M L) have only admitted the mistakes but they did not analyse the character of these mistakes. This is a very essential task since with it is linked up the class character of a party. If it is found that the mistakes are of such nature that the party has failed to pursue the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism covering all aspects of life, then it must be concluded that the party has failed to emerge as a working class party. And it is known to a Marxist-Leninist that a non-working class party i.e., a party of a particular class other than the working class (a party must be a class party in a class divided society) can not be converted into a working class party by reforms. Such thinking is completely erroneous and unscientific.

The leaders of the undivided C.P.I also admitted mistakes many times and expressed pious wishes to proceed in the correct Marxist-Leninist way. But it was seen that they again made mistakes and the history of the CPI shows that it drifted from left adventurism to right reformism since its inception. What is this phenomenon due to? Is it due to lack of sincerity or honesty on the part of those who came to build up communist movement in India? Or is it due to not adhering to the correct Marxist-Leninist methods in the formation of a working class party? As a matter of fact those who came forward to build up the Communist Party of India, made many sacrifices and they did not lack in sincerity, honesty and devotion. But they failed to adopt correct method essential for building up a working class party. Mere pious wishes and sincerity are not enough for building up a working class party. This is the reason why the C.P.I failed to emerge as a working class party inspite of sincerity, sacrifice and devotion of the cadres of the

party. As the undivided C.P.I failed to emerge as a working class party it reflected non-working class world outlook and guided by such a non-Marxian process of thinking it failed to formulate the correct strategy and tactics of Indian revolution. An analysis of the relationship of the undivided C. P. I with the international communist leadership will further prove that this party instead of maintaining a dialectical relation on the basis of unity-struggle-unity with the international communist leadership has been maintaining a mechanical relationship by owing blind allegiance to international leadership. This clearly betrays the non-Marxian process of thinking on the part of the CPI. The ethical and cultural standard reflected in the day-to-day life of the leaders and cadres of the Party is yet another very vital yardstick by which the non-Marxian process of thinking of the C.P.I can be easily judged. C.P.M broke away from this undivided CPI but the leaders of the CPM also did not carry out these tasks essential for the formation of a working class party and so it is observed that the same old vices and non-Marxian process of thinking of the undivided C. P. I are reflected in the CPM also. At present the CPM is in a disadvantageous position in blindly following an international authority particularly after the CPC refused to recognise the CPM as working class party and the CPSU recognises CPI. CPM cannot owe allegiance to it also. Placed in such a position, the CPM threw away all communist code of conduct in attacking the policies of either the CPC or the CPSU. The CPM leaders did not go deep into the questions confronting the international communist movement.

Instead of making a painstaking analysis of these burning questions such blind dependence on international leadership was

necessary as the CPI(ML) did not carry out the struggle for the emergence of collective leadership in India. Instead of such a painstaking struggle the CPI(ML) was formed with a number of parallel groups, owing allegiance to Mao. The parallel leaders of these parallel groups cannot develop a leader of all leaders. But in a communist party collective knowledge develops through struggle, interactions and experiences of leaders and cadres and this collective knowledge is the collective leadership of the party. Again this concept of authority cannot be abstract and so the emergence of collective leadership is proved when this collective knowledge has been personified through a leader in the best possible way. This leader is the leader, teacher and the guide of the party and he is the leader of all leaders. The emergence of a leader of leaders is possible through struggle for collective knowledge and this leader is no product of compromise and adjustment among different leaders of different groups. The CPI (ML) did not produce such a leader of all leaders. From the activities of leaders like, Kanu Sanyal, Sushital Ray Choudhury, Ashim Chatterji, Satya Narayan Sinha etc., it is apparent that none of them considers Charu Mazumder as the philosopher, teacher, leader and guide. The cadres also consider all of them including Charu Mazumdar as the leaders of different groups. The formation of parallel committees with parallel leadership substantiate our contention. When Charu Mazumdar was the general secretary, he was respected for three reasons. Firstly, the honest and dedicated cadres blindly supported him without any analysis of his activities and secondly, as long as there was adjustment, the leaders and cadres of different groups supported him and thirdly, so long he could capitalize on the

(Contd. to page 6)

CPM Finds Radicalism in Congress (R)'s Policies

(Contd. from page 1)

suggested by the Congress(R) are radical in nature—of course the tactical approach and the nature of the vocabulary used to express its feeling no doubt differ from that of the CPI. To substantiate this, we quote below the observation of the CPI(M) regarding bank nationalisation. "The nationalisation of such institutions cannot but be a big event....the measure has opened up some new possibilities, and the progressive forces of the country should intervene to beat back determined reactionary opposition and see that nationalised banks truly become a tool for fighting monopoly interests" (*People's Democracy* dated 3.8.72).

Many prominent leaders of the CPI(M) have welcomed that measure as a step in the right direction.

When both the CPI and the CPI(M) were creating the hope that the nationalised banks would act as tools for fighting monopoly interests it was only our Party under the correct guidance of our leader and teacher, Com. Shibdas Ghosh, the General Secretary of the SUCI, that correctly explained the measure of bank nationalisation adopted in a capitalist country from a Marxist-Leninist point of view and stated ".....For, in a capitalist state when the bourgeoisie takes recourse to nationalisation, it does so in the aggregate interest of capitalism precisely to bring about a coalescence of monopolies with the state and thereby virtually subjugating the state to the interest of the monopolists. In this way the rock bottom foundation of fascism is laid." (*Proletarian Era* dated 3.10.72).

Now let us see what the CPI (M) has stated in regard to bank nationalisation in its Ninth Congress.

It has stated that "The nationalisation of banks in the main was intended to

centralise the banking resources in the government in the interest of the capitalist class as a whole without at the same time injuring the interests of the monopolists. It was further intended to offer credit facilities to a certain extent to some non-big sections of the capitalists who were finding it difficult to get on under the stress of the crisis..."

It might appear that the CPI (M) has changed its former position. But in no way this change has indicated any improvement in regard to the understanding of the real significance of the policy of the bank nationalisation. We think that the above expression lacks in a clear understanding of the fact that the ruling capitalist class has taken recourse to nationalisation in the aggregate interest of capitalism with a view to bringing about a coalescence of monopolies with the state and thereby making the state subservient to the interest of the monopolists. Over and above, we think that the latter part of the resolution stated above would only help to intensify the confusion in the mind of the people in regard to the so-called progressive character of the step like bank nationalisation. The CMP holds the view that the said measure was adopted to offer credit facilities to a certain extent to some non-big sections of the capitalists and in this regard we think that no difference is being observed from the attitude expressed by the Congress (R) itself. The ruling party proclaimed that the credit policy would be formulated with a view to fulfilling the objective of curbing the economic power of the monopolists by offering the non-big or middle section of the capitalists with increased credit facilities and the latter sections of the capitalists with an optimistic hope lent their support to the policy of nationalisation of banks

adopted by the ruling party. We, however, repeatedly asserted that in reality the policy of nationalisation of banks or other industries had been designed solely with the objective of fulfilling the interests of the monopolists.

The measures of nationalisation, if implemented will further consolidate the economic power of the monopolists, subjugate the national economy to them, increase its domination more and more over the non-big and middle sections of the capitalists. The trend of developments in the economic field as being revealed by the reports published by the Monopoly Commission has clearly established our contention.

Leaders of the CPI (M) including Mr. Jyoti Basu have been stated to have expressed that measures and steps suggested by Mrs Gandhi were socialist in nature although the Congress will fail to implement them. Thus the CPM while acknowledging the potential of socialist growth in Mrs. Indira Gandhi's so-called progressive policies however denies the possibility of their actual execution by the Congress(R). Any student of politics and history is well aware of the real significance of social democratic steps taken by the ruling capitalist class even in advanced capitalist countries and knows that it aims precisely at serving the aggregate interest of capitalism on the face of any impending economic crisis. We have observed the adoption of similar steps by Hitler in Germany, Mussolini in Italy before Second World War and De Gaulle in France in the post Second War period.

It is quite astonishing to note that when the Congress (R) is trying to lay down the rock bottom foundation stone of fascism

by adopting the various social democratic steps, the leaders of the CPI(M) are identifying the said steps as socialist in nature. It clearly reflects the utter confusion of the CPI(M) leaders as to the real import of these policies. It appears that the leaders of the CPI (M) believe that there is nothing wrong in the formulation of these policies, but the blame lies with the non-implementation of these policies.

But this is wrong. We think that both Mrs Gandhi and her party would sincerely try to implement the social democratic measures and thereby help to establish the rock bottom foundation of fascism although there are strong impediments now to this bid for all out centralisation of economic power as the forces of regionalism, small production, various local and regional capitalist grouping etc. are a powerful factor adversely affecting this process. If the ruling party, succeeds in overcoming these obstacles and implements the measures and steps suggested by them, which, of course, then will be welcomed by the CPI (M) leaders, then the days would not be very far when the toiling people of India would have to bitterly experience the full fledged fascism in the country. Of course, no one should conclude from this that we oppose the demand for nationalisation of banking and other industries. It is a long-voiced demand by the democratic sections of the people with aims and objects (we have elaborately dealt with this aspect in an article on **Bank Nationalisation** published in *P. Era* dated 3.10.69) radically different from the aims of the capitalist class. What is essential is to draw the distinction between these two aims and expose the real class motive when the bourgeoisie takes recourse to these measures so as to keep the masses from being misled by these progressive gimmicks.

India's Economic Co-operation With USSR

Mr. Basu has further stated that the victory of the Congress-CPI alliance and the rout of the rightist forces in the elections in 1971 and 1972 was a gain for socialism to the extent that a climate of radicalism was created.

Now all of us know that both in 1971 and 1972 elections Mr. Basu's party i.e. the CPI (M) fought against the Congress (R). We would like to ask Mr. Basu that if the victory of the Congress (R)—CPI alliance has created a climate of radicalism then why his party opposed the said alliance in the election battle in both these years? If the victory of the Congress-CPI alliance means a gain for socialism then it would have been the bounden duty of Mr. Basu to stand in favour of the said alliance and lead his party to fight election with the said alliance and not against it. We are really astounded to note that the CPI (M) leaders have failed to grasp the political significance of the so-called radicalism of Congress (R) and have given them the credit for creating a radical climate. The left and democratic people of the country are well convinced of the fact that the ruling Congress party, is trying to establish an all out fascism in our country. The history has repeatedly proved that fascism can not be established without mass support. To get the mass support, to attract the people, a radical cloak is necessary. The ruling Congress party has put on this radical cloak manifested through the adoption of various social democratic measures like nationalisation of banks etc. Along with this in conformity with the attempts in the political and economic fields, attempts are being made in the cultural field too, to accelerate the process of rapid development of all out fascism.

More and more, attempts are being made to create

cultural regimentation through the propagation of fascist culture. Surprisingly, the CPM and some other left party's demand for nationalisation of education will only hasten the process of regimentation of thought as the ruling class is feverishly after to kill the budding revolutionary outlook of the toiling people. One should remember that it is one thing to demand that the government should defray all the educational expenses, but it is quite a different thing to demand nationalisation of education, which will inevitably entail with it greater state control over the educational institutions, eliminate completely the vestiges of autonomous rights of these institutions still existing and pattern education in the chosen line of the exploiting class. The CPM should ask themselves whether their demand for nationalisation of education as reiterated in Chandigarh meeting will not help creating a cultural atmosphere pleasantly suited to the emergence of fascism in a full fledged form. This is most crucial now in the cultural arena as the youths today are betraying extreme fanaticism, hopelessness and desperation and moral depravity is quite rampant in all walks of national life—no doubt, providing a most fertile ground for the inroad of fascism.

All these efforts are being launched by the ruling party with the sole objective of creating an environment congenial to the establishment of an all out fascism in the country. But we are constrained to note that when the bounden duty of any left and democratic party is to reveal the real character of the ruling Congress (R) and expose the hollowness of the so-called radicalism of the Congress (R), the CPI (M) is identifying steps of nationalisation with socialist measures and like the CPI, is searching for radicalism in the Congress (R). We apprehend

that perhaps the CPI (M) do not know the gravity of the danger associated with an incorrect political understanding of the so-called radicalism of Congress (R) that might create an utter confusion among the people about the potential fascist force.

So far as economic co-operation with the Soviet Union is concerned, it may be mentioned that the present policy of economic co-operation with the Soviet Union which has logically developed as an outcome of the policy of non-alignment is helping the Indian bourgeoisie to achieve its objectives. When the Communist Party of India (then a united party, and the present leaders of the CPI (M) were also in the said party) and the other so-called progressive forces in the country hailed the policy of non-alignment advocated by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Prime Minister of India, it was our Party alone under the correct leadership of our General Secretary Com. Shibdas Ghosh that clearly explained how the national bourgeoisie of the newly independent underdeveloped capitalist countries like India would try to benefit by utilising the contradiction existing between the socialist and imperialist camps by this policy. (Interested readers are requested to go through an article *India's policy of non-alignment* **Socialist Unity, Vol. 2, No. 1, Feb. 1963**)

Now when the policy of non-alignment was aimed at getting aids both from the imperialist and the socialist camps, it is quite logical that depending upon the specific national and international situation, the national bourgeoisie of the non-aligned countries with a view to realising its own interest would at times come into a closer co-operation with the imperialist countries and at other times would appear to be closer in relation with the socialist countries.

At present India is passing through a phase, when for Bangladesh and other issues of international importance the Indian bourgeoisie considers that it would gain much from a closer economic relation with the Soviet Union than with the Imperialist camp, and necessarily it has come into a closer tie with the latter country though, of course, it has not cut off its relation with the USA and is receiving aid from the USA. But one should not conclude from this that India's present stance regarding the USA symbolises its drifting from imperialism as such. Rather, as Indian capitalism is developing and has already stepped into the stage of finance capital showing imperialist tendencies, a dual characteristic is being manifested through its foreign policy. While in the economic sphere increasing contradictions are being noticed between Indian bourgeoisie and the foreign finance capital, in the political sphere it shows growing akinness with imperialism. So the present posture of the Indian bourgeoisie as regards the USA is just a reflection of this dual role of the ruling capitalist class and hence, not to be confused as a progressive move as so often depicted by some left parties, including the CPI and the CPM.

Hence when detail analysis in regard to the character of the Congress (R) is concerned the tones expressed both by the CPI and the CPI (M) are very much similar though, of course, they differ in the political vocabularies and way of expressions. We have repeatedly shown that in this respect there is no fundamental difference between the positions of the two parties. The similarity in reaction of these two parties to the recent AICC resolution on economic and industrial policies also proves this contention. Like the CPI, the CPI(M) is also no
(Contd. to page 8)

Process of Formation of a Communist Party

(Contd. from page 3)

support of the CPC, all the groups blindly supported him. But when the CPC withdrew support, Charu Mazumdar was again considered as only a leader of a group. The absence of a leader of all leaders is the reason why the six leaders of the CPI (ML) had to use the prestige and authority of the CPC in their declared objective of rectifying the party to a correct line. Our Party cautioned against such a blind allegiance to international leadership times without number. In criticising such a blind following of the undivided CPI Com. Ghose said:—"The same blind sense of authority worked here also in place of dialectical sense of authority. As a result the same mechanical concept of primemover guided the mutual relationship between communist parties. It was the CPSU that would decide on every question; the business of all other communist parties was to give blind support to the stand of the CPSU. This idea of the leading communist party is alien to Marxism-Leninism. The idea of the leading communist party in the world communist movement does not presuppose an unchangeable permanent leadership of the leading party on every question; nor does it signify blind obedience to the leading party and blind acceptance of whatever it decides. It, on the contrary, presupposes struggles which are not antagonistic in nature and interaction of ideas with the leading communist party and thereby help, objectively, realise the dialectical process, indispensable for collective leadership. It is even comprehended that on any particular question the correct line may be advanced by any party other than the leading party in which case the line of that particular party, as it expresses the collective leadership on that specific question, is accepted by all." ("On

Steps Taken by CPSU Against Stalin by Com. Shibdas Ghosh). This is the correct approach in the relationship with the international leadership, but the undivided CPI and CPI (M) did not reflect this approach in their relation with the international leadership and again the CPI (ML) is also continuing the same blind allegiance to the CPC. Naxalite friends should make self-criticism and analyse in what way does this attitude of the CPI (ML) of blindly following the CPC differ from that of the undivided CPI, the present CPI and the CPM.

Without going deep into these questions and thereby making positive contribution to the growth and development of international communist movement through healthy criticism and suggestions CPM, however, took recourse to wild allegations. This clearly proves the continuity of the same old non-Marxian process of thinking. The CPM was formed by fanning up the militant section of the undivided CPI and after the formation of the CPM when this party also took to the revisionist line, a section from the CPM came out to form the CPI (ML). But alas! the letter written by the six leaders of the CPI (ML) confirmed that this party also continued the bad old method and practice followed inside the Indian communist movement. Though the six leaders expressed the pious wish of rectifying the mistakes, it is seen from their arguments and the way of thinking reflected in the said letter, that these six leaders are also themselves following the same old process of thinking inherited from the undivided CPI. The CPI (ML) blindly followed the CPC after its formation and it is due to blindness and the mechanical approach of blind allegiance that such wrong slogans like "Chairman of China is our Chairman" were raised. The CPI (ML) instead of concretely analysing

the Indian situation obtaining in our country, tried to carbon copy the Chinese revolution. The CPI (ML) like the undivided CPI and CPI (M) failed to realise the distinct role of a party in a particular soil, which will apply the general international line, taking due consideration of the peculiarities of the national conditions. Every communist party must come into a dialectical relationship with one another and also with the international leadership and by such a process not only the revolutionary movements in different countries will acquire newer experiences and knowledge but the international leadership will also be developed and enriched. But this correct Marxist-Leninist approach was singularly lacking and the six leaders in spite of their expressed desire for rectifying the mistakes, advocated for "accepting the suggestions from the great, glorious and correct Chinese Communist Party as the basis, without reservation." This mental make-up of blindly following the international authority has been inherited from the old undivided CPI. Marxism-Leninism teaches us that objective truth can be assessed only if judged on the anvil of history and scientific reasoning and not on the basis of pre-conceived idea of blind authority. The conception of blindly following any authority is opposed to the idea of Marxism-Leninism and this is exactly what the six leaders of CPI (ML) advocated for in the letter circulated by them. That these six leaders who have expressed to rout the left adventurist deviation from the CPI (ML) are not applying Marxist-Leninist line of thinking and behaving like robot is once again confirmed by the fact that though they did not care to pay any heed to our criticisms in our Party booklets and Party organs, they readily accepted "with

utmost devotion and frankness" their guilt when the CPC put forward suggestions which our Party made elaborately even with more precision long before the CPC. Does this show a Marxist-Leninist outlook? A Marxist readily accepts any criticism from any one if these criticisms are based on scientific reasonings. Naxalite friends should seriously think whether these leaders can really build up a correct working class party.

Moreover, the idea about a working class party of these six leaders is also erroneous. These leaders have themselves admitted the existence of various groups within the party and still they have claimed that by rectifying the mistakes the unity within the party can be restored and the armed agrarian struggle can be carried forward. Such conclusion by the six leaders of the CPI (ML) clearly shows that they do not have even the elementary knowledge of the process of forming a genuine working class party. Groups can exist and do exist in a bourgeois or a petty-bourgeois party; but no group can exist in a true communist party. Even the idea of uniting the various groups into a communist party is incompatible with Marxism-Leninism. What do these groups within a party mean? This groupism means parallel trends of thought, which is possible only in a petty bourgeois party. In a communist party, to eliminate the root causes of the group mental make-up, a conscious struggle within the party is constantly carried out to free the cadres and leaders of the pernicious influence of individualism. So any attempt to form a communist party by uniting different groups must end in utter failure.

With a view to building up a real communist party, certain essential tasks must be fulfilled. Firstly, a socialist movement covering each and

Main Task of a Communist Party is to Concretise Revolutionary Theory in Its Own Soil

every aspect of life including private life is to be created and secondly, a protracted ideological struggle is to be carried out for the emergence of a collective leadership through ideological and organisational centralism. Until this collective leadership takes a concrete shape, it will be wrong to give a organisational shape to the party as in that case the party will not be democratically centralised but only mechanically centralised. The democratic centralism is the living soul of a communist party and this democratic centralism is the criteria by which one can judge whether a party is really a communist party or not. The difference between the democratic centralism and the mechanical centralism lies in the fact that while in a democratically centralised party, a fusion between proletarian democracy and centralism has been made, in the mechanically centralised party, the concept of proletarian democracy has been virtually replaced by formal democracy. "Democratic centralism is the fusion of centralism with proletarian democracy. It must always be borne in mind that proletarian democracy is not formal democracy which is only a reflection of bourgeois social order. Proletarian democracy is based on proletarian world outlook. So not even the most formally democratic constitution with the most liberal provisions can achieve democratic centralism in a party. Its success depends mainly on the necessary ideological standard of the members of the party so as to ensure 'discussion in dialogue', in actuality, in the party-body and on the conscious proletarian revolutionary role of the members of the party. Authoritarianism having its full sway and in the absence of actual struggles

and inter-action of ideas in the party "discussion and decision of major problems in party bodies" however, indispensable it may be for collective leadership, does not *ipso facto* establish collective leadership. In bourgeois parties also "discussion and decision of major problems in party bodies" take place. But no sensible man will, on this ground, say that collective leadership operates in bourgeois parties. Same is the case with a working class party where democratic centralism has degenerated into practice of centralism based on formal democracy. "Discussion and decision of major problems" in such parties is at best a committee decision. Collective leadership is not just a committee decision. Social consciousness in the form of collective knowledge of the members of the party is collective leadership" (**"On Steps Taken Against Stalin" by Com. Shibdas Ghosh**) Unlike in democratic centralism where the ideological standard of the cadres is constantly raised through constant common struggle and constant common discussion by which erroneous views are constantly in the process of elimination and the decision is evolved, in mechanical centralism, decisions are made by the leaders and the cadres who have no role in making the decision and merely carry out the decision blindly and mechanically. It is because of the absence of proletarian democracy in such a party that the ideological standard of the cadres and even of leaders is not raised and this is reflected in their fanaticism, blindness, lack of philosophical tolerance, egoism and downgraded cultural and ethical standard. The organisation of a communist party is like that of a living organism, in which all the parts of a body are organically linked up with the central

nervous system. Similarly in a communist party, the leader and the ordinary rank and file are organically linked up in a dialectical process. The struggle for the emergence of such a leader is an essential task for building up a communist party.

In spite of Marx and Engels the emergence of Lenin in Russian soil was a pre-condition for the success of Russian revolution. Similarly, in spite of the existence of such stalwart Marxists like Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin the necessity for emergence of Mao in China for concretisation of Marxism-Leninism in Chinese soil was a necessary pre-condition for the success of the Chinese revolution. This is necessary as in applying the general international line in a particular soil, a contradiction between the general and the particular is inevitable and so with a view to correctly applying this general line by resolving contradiction with the peculiarities of the national situation, the store house of Marxism-Leninism is to be enriched in a particular soil. One can correctly follow Mao if he can really understand the methodology by which Mao analysed the then Chinese situation and brought about revolution in that country and by acquiring that methodology he can apply the knowledge in analysing the Indian situation. Mere carbon copy of Chinese revolution is an absurdity and an impossibility. From the letter written by the six leaders of the C.P.I (M L) it is clear that they do not have such an idea about a communist party or such a Marxist angularity. Had they possessed such an idea of a party which is democratically centralised and in which the emergence of a leader of all leaders, within the party to correctly concretise Marxism-Leninism in India, has been possible, they must

have paused to think over the character of a party before making Charu Mazumdar mainly responsible for the left adventurist deviations. Does it not show that the C.P.I (M L) also comprises of leaders who make decisions and cadres who blindly carry out those decisions. Such relations with leaders and cadres are quite alien in a genuine communist party. It is a clear proof that the C. P. I (M L) was never democratically centralised. If it is not so, will the cadres of the C.P.I (M L) ponder whether it was at all a communist party in the true sense of the term?

CPI(ML) tried to blindly follow the Chinese Communist Party but did not grasp the process of thinking through which Mao applied the general principle of Marxism-Leninism in Chinese soil. And since the CPI(ML) failed to understand the methodology and the process of thinking of Mao in bringing about Chinese revolution they even did not understand the pros and cons of Chinese revolution. So in spite of their claim of following the Chinese revolution, they failed to do it also. If they could understand the process of thinking, they would have not only understood the Chinese revolution in its entirety but also refrained from carbon-copying the Chinese revolution as they would have understood through that process of thinking that without concretisation of Marxism-Leninism in Indian soil through concrete analysis of Indian situation obtaining in our country, Indian revolution would not be possible.

From the above discussion it is clear that the CPI (M L) also failed to emerge as a genuine working class party and it is due to this it has failed to formulate the correct strategy and tactics of Indian revolution by concretely

(Contd. to page 8)

CPM's Alliance With Right Reactionaries

(Contd. from page 5)

less generous in giving progressive certificates to the Indira wing of the Congress which contributed much to ruling party's attempt to project a radical image of it before the people. It may not be out of place to mention that our leader and teacher Com. Shibdas Ghosh, after making a thorough scientific analysis of the formation of the Communist Party (united), the present CPI and the CPI(M), their strategy and tactics, their concept of stage of revolution in India, their concept of the revolutionary ideas of Marxism-Leninism that they have put forward from time to time in the face of different national and international situation, once made the comment that these two parties follow the "same political line, same methodological approach, same cultural standard with some variations in some political vocabularies and behaviour i.e. in tactical approach" (*Why SUC is the only Communist party in India — Com. Shibdas Ghosh*).

Now so far as the CPI(M)'s anti-Congress attitude is concerned we have repeatedly stated before that the CPI(M)'s anti-Congress attitude grew in intensity at a time when all its hope to come to a sort of understanding with the Congress(R) on an all India plane were frustrated as Mrs. Gandhi preferred to accommodate the CPI as her associate as the CPI had a greater stature on an all India plane than the CPI(M). We are of considered opinion that the CPI(M)'s anti-Congress attitude has not developed out of any consistent left political angularity. No doubt, the CPM with a view to utilising the anti-Congress sentiment of the people, for building up its organisation fights against Congress even at times in closer understanding with the right reactionary forces whom it often pledges to fight

against tooth and nail. For example, in Kerala mid-term poll it did not even hesitate to join hands with the Congress(O), Jan Sangh and other reactionary forces. The recent statement of the CPI(M) and CPM leader Mr. Hare Krishna Konar's address at a public meeting in support of Mr. Biren Mitra against the Congress(R) candidate Mrs. Nandini Satpathi in the recent by-election in Orissa may be cited as another testifying example. Though the CPM boasts of being the biggest left party in the country one fails to understand why the CPM instead of trying to field a left candidate supported by all the left and democratic parties in the State, as proposed by SUCI, joined the bandwagon of arch reactionaries like the Swatantra, Jan Sangh etc. Is it not following a petty pragmatic interest to anyhow expand its organisation even by sacrificing its leftist image? Does not this behaviour of the CPM pave the way for the right reactionary forces to entrench itself deeper at the cost of leftism? Besides, what sort of political honesty is it when it clearly contradicts CPM'S professed stand to consistently fight the right reactionaries to the bitter end?

Will the cadres of the CPM seriously ponder over this unprincipled behaviour and narrow political outlook vividly shown by the leaders?

Some Questions Concerning

C. P. I. (ML)

(Contd. from page 7)

analysing the Indian situation on the anvil of Marxism-Leninism and instead tried to carbon copy the Chinese revolution. Now can such a non-working class party be rectified into a working class party? The problem of the CPC was quite different. The CPC emerged as a working class party and the

Victory of D.S.O. Workers Victory Meeting in Orissa In Rourkela

Com. Krucshna Chandra Bal, who contested as a DSO candidate for the post of General Secretary, of Cuttack, Ravenshaw College Students Union, has come out victorious in the election held on 23rd November last. Incidentally it should be mentioned that the DSO captured this post in the last year election and has been able to retain this post this year also due to its steadily increasing strength and influence among the students.

DSO has scored another glorious victory in Jagatsingpur, SVM College Students Union election held recently where Com. Surendra Praharaj, a member of the Orissa State Committee of DSO has been elected as the President of the College Union.

This victory of the DSO has heightened its prestige as a fighting student organisation and created great interest among the student community in Orissa.

problem of the CPC was the problem of a working class party of keeping it in the right track by fighting left deviation and right opportunism. But a party like the CPI(ML) which failed to emerge as a working class party can never be converted into a working class party by doing away with its mistakes; because this idea is erroneous and hence impracticable. So those who seriously desire to bring about a radical transformation of the Indian society through revolution, must shun the company of these pseudo-communist parties and instead strengthen the SUCI which has emerged as a real working class party under the leadership of Com. Shibdas Ghosh whose analysis of national and international questions have been historically proved to be correct.

Rourkela, 17th November : Sri Naba Krishna Choudhury, the eminent Sarbodya leader declared in the meeting held yesterday at the Industrial Estate to celebrate the victory of the workers of the Prabhat Iron Foundry and East India Engineering workers that excepting the SUCI all other Marxist parties in India failed to hold high the banner of socialism and the SUCI alone was able to follow the correct line of communism.

Under the leadership of the SUCI, Rourkela Workers' Union compelled the management to accept the main demands of the workers at a tripartite conference on 10th November last. Incidentally it is to be mentioned that a prominent organiser of the SUCI and two other workers were killed in police firing on this strike issue.

Sri Naba Krishna Choudhury recalled the heroic attempt of the SUCI to maintain the unity of the West Bengal UF when it was endangered by right opportunism on one hand and left opportunism of CPM on the other in breaking the cohesion of the UF through its disruptive policy of armed attack on other partners of UF with the help of police. Sri Choudhury continued that the cherished goal for which people fought for Swaraj has not been attained as this Swaraj is meant for the rich to exploit the poor. He said that in no independent country the Arms Act should continue; but in India people are rendered impotent through this Arms Act.

Com. Prakash Singh presided over the meeting and Com. B Jena, the labour leader, Com. Sheik Kasim, Com. Pusha Mian and Com. Dhurjati Das, the student leader were among the speakers.